

IDAHO EMERGENCY COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

OFFICIAL MINUTES

July 7, 2005

A meeting of the Idaho Emergency Communications Commission (IECC) was held on this date in the West Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building, Boise, Idaho. Chairman Nancolas called the meeting to order at 1:07 p.m.

Members Present:

Garret Nancolas, Mayor, City of Caldwell, Commission Chairman
Rich Wills, State Representative and Commission Vice-Chairman
R. David Moore, Blackfoot Police Chief, Commission Treasurer
Ann Cronin, Special Assistant, Idaho State Police (ISP), Commission Secretary
Teresa Baker, Ada County Prosecutor's Office (arrived at 1:40 p.m.)
Bill Bishop, Director, Bureau of Homeland Security (BHS)
Dia Gainor, Chief, Idaho Bureau of Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
Ben Estes, Retired Chief, Pocatello Fire Department
Joanna Guilfooy, Deputy Attorney General and Ex-Officio Member

Members Absent:

Matt Beebe, Commissioner, Canyon County Commission
Clint Berry, Qwest, Boise
Gary Aman, Owyhee County Sheriff
Jim Lemm, J&R Electronics, Inc., Coeur d'Alene
Greg Vickers, Idaho Emergency Medical Services Association

Others Present:

Joe Roche, Department of Administration (ADM)
Rick Thompson, Department of Administration
Lex Rutter, Department of Administration
Les Shadduck, Ada County Sheriff's Office
Tony Poinelli, Idaho Association of Counties
Dodie Collier, Statewide Interoperability Executive Council

Sandy Harris, Statewide Interoperability Executive Council
Scot Maring, Department of Administration

Approval of Agenda

MOTION: Commissioner Cronin moved and Commissioner Moore seconded that the meeting agenda be accepted. The motion passed unanimously.

Approval of Minutes

MOTION: Commissioner Moore moved and Commissioner Gainor seconded that the Commission approve the minutes of the June 2, 2005 Idaho Emergency Communications Commission meeting with correction of a typing error. The motion passed unanimously.

Financial Reports

Operating Budget

Mr. Rick Thompson, ADM's Internal Management Systems Administrator, reported that as of the end of June, the Commission had spent \$7,412.13 of its Fiscal Year (FY) 2005 budgeted amount of \$97,500. He also stated that there would soon be one of two deductions for Administrative Support expenses reflected.

The **Estimated Sources and Uses Fund** Statement and the **Revenue** Statement, he said, illustrate that the total amount received to date from county assessments is \$70,023.24. The amounts shown for the first three quarters are actual amounts. As of June 30, 2005, the total amount of money in the bank is \$65,151.

During discussion, it was clarified that the financial reports are all as of October 1, 2004, and not based on the State's fiscal year.

Commissioner Moore stated that he had discovered a discrepancy in the projected amount of money estimated to be received from Bear Lake County and verified it with county officials. The amount shown as \$17.00 should in fact be \$170.00. This puts their amount received to date at 55.46% of estimate and not 554.6%. Commissioner Moore also stated that he would continue to look for other discrepancies.

Commissioner Cronin asked if there was value in posting the financial report to the website. Following discussion, Chairman Nancolas directed that the financial report be added to the website after narrative is added to clarify the time periods reflected.

MOTION: Commissioner Moore moved and Commissioner Estes seconded that the financial report be accepted. The motion passed unanimously.

Rules for Distribution of Funds

Commissioner Gainor presented draft version 5.2 of the Rules for Distribution of Funds as prepared by the subcommittee (Commissioners Gainor, Baker, and Guilfooy) and covered the changes made since version 5.1 had been presented last month. Commissioner Guilfooy added that in order to have the rules done as proposed rules and only have to present them once to the Legislature, the rules must be submitted to the Office of Administrative Rules by August 24th.

The Commissioners then went through the draft page-by-page to insure the language was correct and that the rules cover the Commission's intent. Commissioner Guilfooy stated that she would take the changes and make the final draft. Chairman Nancolas directed that the subcommittee and its chair bring back the document for final approval at the next meeting. It was pointed out that the next meeting would be the last opportunity to approve the draft in order to meet the August 24th deadline.

Needs Assessment Survey

Commissioner Baker provided a handout showing the response status of the Dispatch Center Profile survey. Responses have been completed or received by thirty-eight (38) of the forty-four (44) counties. Six counties have not responded to the survey. In addition, SIRCOMM and five of the six cities with dispatch centers have completed the survey. Only one city with a dispatch center has not responded. Les Shadduck, Ada County Sheriff's Office, added that each 911 service area that has not responded had received at least two letters and a phone call about the survey. He will continue working on getting the responses.

SIEC Update

Dodie Collier, representing the Statewide Interoperability Executive Council (SIEC), gave an update on recent SIEC actions and changes. Highlights included:

- At the beginning of 2005, there were changes to the council composition. Lorin Nielsen now represents the Idaho Sheriffs' Association, Marcia Phillips now represents the Idaho Association of Counties, Reggie Thorpe now represents the Idaho Tribal Government, and Scott Reese now represents the Association of Idaho Cities.
- The SIEC Outreach Subcommittee is working on a second generation DVD and several SIEC members have attended meetings throughout the state in order to publicize their efforts.
- Several members attended the National Governors Association Policy Academy in Atlanta, GA, in March 2005.
- The SIEC Technical Subcommittee completed and the Council adopted a Concept for Interoperable Communications which will be presented to the Governor on July 13, 2005.

Sandy Harris, also representing the SIEC, added that they will be participating in the Bureau of Homeland Security's yearly "Idaho Prepared" conference in Lewiston, ID, September 26-30. They will be giving two presentations during the afternoon of September 28 and have a display

during the morning of September 29th. She added that this is a great opportunity to get the word out about their council and invited the IECC to be a part of the presentations and display. Any Commissioners interested should contact Scot Maring so that he can coordinate IECC participation.

Review Action Items/Next Steps

Commissioner Cronin discussed reorganizing the action items list. By looking at the list to determine the flow and organization of it, she came up with a document entitled “IECC Prioritized Activities” which grouped all action items into four priorities.

Following discussion, it was decided that it would be best if the action items are re-brainstormed since the Commission members were more knowledgeable of the issues now than at the first meeting in August 2004. The original list and Commissioner Cronin’s “IECC Prioritized Activities” will be sent to all members so that they come to the August 2005 meeting prepared to discuss and reform the list of action items.

New Business

NASNA Update

Commissioner Cronin gave an update on her trip to the National Emergency Number Association (NENA) conference in California, June 25-31. As part of this conference, the National Association of State 9-1-1 Administrators (NASNA) had a one-day meeting. Commissioner Cronin’s notes from the NASNA meeting are incorporated as an attachment to these minutes.

Also discussed at the NASNA meeting was the fact that nationally, emergency communication entities and others involved with E911 issues recommend that responsibility for E911 deployment in each state reside with a statewide coordinator or administrator. Commissioner Cronin provided a handout and stated that all data points to the fact that a statewide coordinator/administrator and a reliable funding source are keys to the success of E911 deployment. Commissioner Moore pointed out that it was noted early after the creation of the IECC that the time will come that a statewide administrator may be needed.

MOTION: Commissioner Moore moved and Commissioner Gainor seconded that the Commission pay Commissioner Cronin’s NASNA membership dues of \$100.00 for the time period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006. The motion passed unanimously.

Mediation Posting

Commissioner Cronin recommended that the mediation findings be posted to the website. Following discussion it was decided that a description of the mediation process and the findings are to be posted.

Future Meeting Coordination

MOTION: Following discussion, Commissioner Wills moved and Commissioner Bishop seconded that the August 4th meeting be held in Boise and the September 1st meeting be held in Pocatello. The motion passed unanimously. The August 4th meeting is scheduled to begin at 1:00 p.m. in the West Conference Room, Joe R. Williams Building, 700 West State Street, Boise. Commissioner Moore will work on scheduling a location in Pocatello for the September meeting.

Other new business

Commissioner Wills asked for a verification of the term lengths and term expiration dates for Commission members. During discussion, the question was also asked concerning the procedure when a Commission member is an elected official but does not get reelected. Scot Maring added that he would look into the issues and provide the information to the Commission members.

Open Comment Period

Dodie Collier, representing the SIEC, stated that she would be more than happy to travel around the state with the IECC to their meetings. In addition to giving the SIEC report, it would give her the opportunity to make contacts around the state and conduct SIEC business in those locations. The Commission concurred as long as her travel is funded by the SIEC.

Adjournment

MOTION: It was moved by Commissioner Bishop and seconded by Commissioner Cronin to adjourn the July 7, 2005 Idaho Emergency Communications Commission meeting at 3:25 p.m. The motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Garret Nancolas, Chairman
Idaho E911 Emergency Communications Commission

Scot R. Maring, Administrative Assistant
Department of Administration

1 attachment (NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE 9-1-1 ADMINISTRATORS)

Addendum: Commission Progress on its Prioritized Activities

Funding

~~Portion of 1% to be assessed (4 votes)~~
How to fund the “have-nots” (2 votes)
Sub-optimize by city?
~~Grant funding resources~~
~~Commission (ECC) funding/budget (1 vote)~~
Recommendation/advice on E911 spending
(ECC needs to decide scope)
Proactive to fund more than systems
(e.g. services, training, implementation)
(How will Title 31 money be used)
~~Federal funds application process~~
(track, assess, audit, measure)
~~Fee collection vs. ECC assistance~~
(City must vote in fees)
Statewide E911 procurement contracts
(Mutual needs buying power)
Conduit for funding

Systems

Scope of system—ECC role (equip, people)
Money for infrastructure
System implementation
(technical issue, project management)
Technical resources
Who defines architecture, and how do we
use and leverage systems
Need to understand baseline (education)
Identify technical resources & leverage
Regulate and consolidate systems
System interoperability standards
Business continuity—backup/recovery
Standards to engage vendors
Define minimum standards for system,
vendors (including purchasing)
Standards for a consolidated emergency
communication system

Evaluation/Assessment

What is the baseline by County (as-is) (5 votes)
Leverage Office of Disaster Preparedness survey
Evaluate current standards
Recommend model – performance indicators
Establish “to-be” baseline

Governance

~~Cooperation—PSAP representation~~
~~Know statutory responsibilities (1 vote)~~
~~ECC by laws, committees (10 votes)~~
~~Guidelines for operations~~
Define level of mediation funding
Recommend model org. structure
ECC focus on all areas
(Clearinghouse for E911 assistance)
Long-term vision
(systems, organizations, processes)
Short-term tactical plan
~~ECC statewide representation~~
~~Acquire wireless representative member~~
~~Mediation Standards/Criteria~~
ECC staff support (1 vote)
Stay focused on mission
Rules for distributing moneys

Education/Information

~~How will the 1% assessment be used~~
E911 need for money, improvements
Promote cohesive, solidarity,
interoperability, statewide cooperation
SIEC et. al.--standard definitions
Communicate—who’s doing what?
Message: consolidate, coordinate,
funding, standards, leverage, etc.
May conflict with autonomy.
~~Tech. Educ. of ECC members (9 votes)~~

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE 9-1-1 ADMINISTRATORS
Long Beach, California
June 26 & 28, 2005

The National Association of State 9-1-1 Administrators met in Long Beach, California June 26 and 28, 2005. Twenty-one of the thirty-two states with a central 911 administrative or planning function were represented. The meeting convened at 8:00 a.m. June 26 in Room 102 of the Long Beach Convention Center.

NASNA provides an acronym-rich environment and the meeting began with a NRIC/ESIF TF34/NENA NG911 update.

NRIC is the Network Reliability and Interoperability Council, a group of communications industry and public safety professionals who partner with the Federal Communications Commission “to facilitate enhancement of emergency communications networks, homeland security, and best practices across the burgeoning telecommunications industry.” (Mission statement)

NRIC sponsors focus groups examining FCC rulings and technology issues to provide implementation guidance. Focus group 1 recently examined and reported on the topic of Enhanced 911 in three areas. Subcommittee 1A reported on near term issues; subcommittee 1B reported on long term issues; and subcommittee 1C reported on network outages and best practices. All reports can be found at <http://www.nric.org/fg/index.html> .

NASNA voted to support the final report from NRIC subcommittee 1A. The 1B and 1C reports are not yet considered final.

ESIF is the Emergency Services Interconnection Forum within the Alliance for Telecommunications Industry Solutions. Task Force 34 examined next generation emergency services messaging needs at the same time that NENA pursued its recommendations, called NG911 (Next Generation 911). The ESIF report can be found at <http://www.atis.org/esif/docs/Public-Contributions/TF34-Overview-05-24-05.pdf> . All NENA reports can be found at www.nena.org

Both reports deal with IP based communications and their implications for the nation’s public safety communities. Both envision an internet-based 911 system, but two different models are under discussion. One is an open structure, where PSAPs connect directly to the internet. This model carries considerable risks to be resolved. The second model envisions a managed connection, in essence a dedicated 911 internet system. A number of telecommunications providers are developing managed systems.

It was pointed out that there is a distinction between VoIP and internet-based E911 services. VoIP is its own system, which will be delivered to the PSAP response gateway, while IP based communications can originate from any number of nomadic devices.

Representatives from Vonage, Intrado and TCS provided a briefing titled “Voice over IP – the next 120 days”.

May 19, 2005, the FCC published a ruling “In the Matters of IP Enabled Services”.

The Order requires “collection of information in four instances. First, interconnected VoIP providers must obtain from each customer, prior to the initiation of service, the physical location at which the service will first be utilized, and must provide customers a way to update this information (*i.e.*, the “Registered Location”).

“Second, interconnected VoIP providers must place the Registered Location information for their customers into, or make that information available through, ALI Databases maintained by local exchange carriers (and, in at least one case, a state government) across the country.

“Third, the Order requires all providers of interconnected VoIP service specifically to advise new and existing subscribers of the circumstances under which E911 service may not be available through the interconnected VoIP service or may be in some way limited by comparison to traditional E911 service, and to obtain and keep a record of affirmative acknowledgement by every subscriber of having received and understood this advisory.

“Fourth, the Order requires all interconnected VoIP providers to submit a letter to the Commission detailing their compliance with the rules set forth in the Order no later than 120 days after the effective date of the Order.”

They also imposed other requirements on interconnected VoIP services providers, specifically that “within 120 days of the effective date of the Order, an interconnected VoIP provider must transmit all 911 calls, as well as a call back number and the caller’s Registered Location for each call, to the PSAP, designated statewide default answering point, or appropriate local emergency authority that serves the caller’s Registered Location and that has been designated for telecommunications carriers under section 64.3001 of the Commission’s rules.”

The Notice of Proposed Rulemaking runs 90 pages and there is more to it than quoted above, but the above paragraph launched the discussion with service providers. It can be viewed at <http://www.E911institute.org/FCC%20June%203,%202005.doc>

Service providers are faced with two-fold compliance in delivering the E911 service. One compliance area is to ensure that their products are E911 functional. The other compliance area is PSAP deployment. Since PSAP deployment occurs at the request of the PSAP, this is the more difficult compliance area for service providers.

As with other proposed FCC rulemaking, various entities are working together to find a workable process for compliance.

During the “Association Business” segment of the meeting two requests for alliance were introduced. NENA has requested a MOU from NASNA regarding support for NENA initiatives. After discussion it was agreed that NASNA will examine individual NENA

initiatives as they occur and, by a vote of the Association either support the initiative or not, but will not enter into a MOU expressing blanket support for all initiatives.

The U.S. Wireless Access Coalition (USWAC) requested that NASNA consider joining the coalition. Their goal is to advocate for greater consumer access to reliable wireless communications through the deployment of adequate infrastructure.

During discussion of the invitation it became evident that there could be a perception that each member spoke for his or her state in terms of policy on the issue of infrastructure deployment. This is not a perception any of us want to foster. The NASNA executive board will do further research into USWAC and report on it at our fall meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m., until 10:00 a.m. June 28, 2005.

The meeting reconvened at 10:00 a.m. June 28, 2005 in the lobby of the Hyatt Hotel.

The future of the organization was discussed. NASNA has become a respected entity in the 911 community. There are opportunities to contribute to or support national initiatives regarding 911. We discussed increasing the cost of dues to cover longer meetings and provide for more amenities at those meetings. While all were in favor of the increase, an amount was not agreed upon. Bob Oenning (NASNA treasurer and Washington State E911 Coordinator) will research some future funding needs and bring the information back to the group.

The difficulty of dealing with prepaid (throw away) cellular phones was discussed. Because the service is paid for "up front", it is difficult to assess any fee for those states having fee mechanisms, and likewise difficult to include in an E911 compliance plan. States having a funding mechanism favored a point-of-sale fee collection.

The nexus of E911 coordinators and governing boards with radio interoperability entities was discussed. None of the states reported having established cooperative relationships. Most seemed to be just realizing the need for collaboration. The broader topic of coordination of radio interoperability, 911 services, homeland security, statewide communications and transportation initiatives was introduced. All present believe states can benefit from a coordinating entity or office within state government while preserving delivery of service at the local level. A parallel was drawn to the coordinating office created at the federal level during last year's Congressional session, to ensure coordination among all organizations dealing with E911 deployment. NASNA members will recommend and support development of these partnerships within their home states.

State funding mechanisms were discussed. It has been noted that the states with both a statewide coordinator or administrator and a funding mechanism are the most successful in reaching E911 deployment compliance, regardless of the implementation plan. The state of Georgia has a very successful program using a statewide coordinator to disburse funds collected through a surcharge to eligible county PSAPs. The actual delivery of the emergency response system is at the county level. Arizona, California, the Commonwealth of Virginia and other states have roughly the same model. Few states have a state-level PSAP system. State

surcharges vary from \$.28 to \$1.00. Harriet Miller-Brown, 911 State Administrator for Michigan surveyed NASNA membership on the topic of funding amounts, mechanisms and distributions, and will be collating that information with the assistance of an intern in the near future.

The next NASNA meeting will be in September or October in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania to accommodate attendance by Congressional staffers and representatives from the National Governors Association.

The meeting adjourned at 12:30 p.m.